

### REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 10, 2004, claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,185,625 to Tso, et al. ("Tso"). Claims 2-4 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,252 to Oka, et al. ("Oka"). Claims 5-7 and 12-14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 15 was allowed over prior art of record.

In the present amendment claims 1-4 and 8-11 are cancelled. Claims 5-7 and claims 12-14 have been rewritten to include all the limitations of the respective original base claims and intervening claims on which they depend. Claim 16, which depends on claim 15, has been added. The latter claim is written to recite all the features of dependent claim 5, does not introduce new subject matter, and accordingly requires no new search.

Accordingly, upon entry of the present amendment, claims 5-7, 12-14, and 15-16 will be pending. At least for its dependence on allowed claim 15, claims 16 is believed to be allowable.

Serial No.: 09/499,961  
Art Unit 2644

Attorney's Docket No.: LET-103-R6  
Page 12


In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102  
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: June 22, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

TOBIAS, ET AL.

By:   
Michael A. Oblon  
Registration No. 42,956

MAO/RAR/

Customer No. 28970